Second Regional Call for Methane Action

Submission and Evaluation Guidelines

2027

1. General Information

Aspect	Call information
Opening date	November 2, 2026
Submission deadline	January 31, 2027, at 23:59 (Quito time, UTC-5). Late submissions will not be accepted.
Application form	https://forms.gle/hYWh43mf3G5emWTi9
Inquiries	oemlac@olacde.org
Required document	One PDF of up to 100 MB, in Spanish or English, with a main body of up to 10 pages.
Announcement of results	Results will be communicated by email to the designated contact person.

2. Purpose of the Call

The Latin America and the Caribbean Methane Emissions Observatory (OEMLAC), as part of the IV Regional Summit of Methane, invites submissions to identify, showcase, and connect work that contributes to the recovery and valorization of methane and the management of methane emissions in the region.

2.1. Opportunities for Selected Submissions

- **In-person presentation at the IV Regional Summit of Methane**, subject to available slots on the event program.
- **Potential inclusion in the White Paper on Methane in the Energy Sector of Latin America and the Caribbean**, subject to its editorial criteria.
- **Presentation in the virtual technical sessions of the OEMLAC Community of Practice (COEMLAC),** subject to its annual schedule.

Selection may result in the assignment of one or more participation options listed in Section 2.1, according to the announced number of slots and selection ranking. Inclusion in the White Paper is not automatic: the work must be relevant to its energy-sector focus, supported by sufficient evidence, and authorized by its authors.

2.2. Eligible Individuals and Institutions

Applications may be submitted individually or jointly by independent professionals and individuals affiliated with public institutions, companies, universities, research centers, or civil society organizations, provided their work relates to the methane agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Each application must designate a **contact person**, who will serve as the point of contact with OEMLAC throughout the process.

3. Types of Submissions and Thematic Scope

3.1. Eligible Types of Work

Type of work	Description and scope
Completed work	A completed research study, project, or initiative, including results and conclusions.
Research in progress	Ongoing work presenting preliminary results and a plan for completion.
Case study	Analysis of a specific implementation experience, including its results and lessons learned.
Technical note	A brief document on a method, technology, dataset, or policy recommendation.

3.2. Thematic Areas

Each submission must be assigned to one primary thematic area and may also indicate a secondary area. Area 1 covers methane recovery and valorization; Area 2 covers methane emissions management. Listing more than one thematic area does not earn additional points.

3.2.1. Methane Recovery and Valorization

Area 1 addresses methane as an energy resource and product, including its production, recovery, conditioning, transportation, storage, and use. It covers opportunities to utilize natural gas, biogas, and biomethane, with emphasis on energy and operational efficiency, loss reduction, and value creation in the region's productive activities.

Submissions may present experiences, projects, and technological solutions aimed at making better use of available resources, optimizing processes, and expanding applications. They may address gas quality, technical and economic feasibility, infrastructure and market access, as well as the investment, regulation, and capabilities needed to develop these projects.

3.2.2. Methane Emissions Management

Area 2 covers the identification of sources; the measurement, quantification, prevention, and control of methane emissions; and the monitoring, reporting, and verification of results. It includes practices and technologies applicable across sectors to prevent methane venting and leaks and improve operational and environmental performance, taking into account the processes and operating conditions involved.

Submissions may address measurement and monitoring technologies, leak detection and repair programs, implementation experiences, and improvements to equipment, maintenance, and operating practices that contribute to facility integrity. They may also examine the technical and institutional capacities, regulatory frameworks, reporting standards, and financing mechanisms needed to implement these measures and verify their results using reliable data.

3.3. Sectors and Areas of Application

Submissions are welcome on the measurement, monitoring, prevention, and reduction of methane emissions; methane capture and energy recovery; biogas and biomethane; and energy efficiency or fuel substitution associated with these activities.

Sectors include hydrocarbons, mining, biogas and biomethane, hydroelectric reservoirs, and geothermal energy, as well as other **energy-related** sectors or cross-sector approaches addressing either of the thematic areas in Section 3.2.

1. Call Timeline

Date or period	Process stage
November 2, 2026	Submissions open
January 31, 2027 (23:59, Quito time, UTC-5)	Submission deadline
February 1–3, 2027	Eligibility screening
February 4–12, 2027	Technical evaluation of submissions
February 15, 2027	Announcement of results by email

2. Submission Document Requirements

2.1. Minimum Content

The main body of the PDF must include the following eight elements, in the order shown or another clearly identifiable order. For technical notes and policy recommendations, the methodology may consist of a document review, comparison, calculation, or systematic review of sources.

- Title of the work.
- Authors and institutions.
- Problem addressed and objective.
- Methodology or procedure.
- Main result and other results or progress achieved, distinguished from expected results.

- Sources and evidence supporting the results.
- Contribution to Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Potential for application or replication.

Research-in-progress submissions must present the preliminary results obtained and their limitations. Technical notes may present a method, analysis, dataset, or evidence-based recommendation as their result. Being preliminary or not yet implemented does not, in itself, lower the score.

2.2. File Format and Presentation

Format requirement	Presentation requirement
File	One PDF of up to 100 MB.
Length	Main body of up to 10 pages, including the cover page, tables, figures, and references. Annexes must appear at the end of the same PDF, do not count toward this limit, and may only support content in the main body.
Language	Spanish or English.
Font	Arial 11.
Line spacing	1.5.
Paper and margins	A4 paper with 2.54 cm margins.
File name	LastName_PrimaryArea_ShortTitle.pdf. For joint submissions, use the last name of the designated contact person

3. Submission Procedure

- **Step 1:** Prepare the PDF document describing the work in accordance with the requirements in Section 5.

- **Step 2:** Complete the official application form and attach the PDF. If the file exceeds the upload limit, it may be submitted through a link, provided it does not exceed the 100 MB limit in Section 5.2.

  The PDF and its annexes must contain only information authorized for sharing (Section 11.3). The link must open the file without requiring access permission or sign-in.

- **Step 3:** Review the information entered, accept the final declaration, and submit the form.

- **Step 4:** If you submitted the file through a link, keep it available, unchanged, and accessible with the required permissions until the results are announced. The version received before the deadline will be evaluated.

  Replacements, changes in content, and new evidence will not be accepted after the deadline.

A separate application is required for each work. If a work is submitted more than once, only the latest complete application received before the deadline will be considered.

Responses must comply with the character limits for each field. The alignment with evaluation criteria depends on the content specified in Section 8.2 and Annex A, not on the question numbering.

4. Eligibility Requirements

The eligibility screening is the first stage. Using the form and PDF, the coordinating team will verify that each application meets the following six requirements:

Eligibility requirement	Compliance condition
1. Submitted on time	The completed form and accessible PDF or link were received by January 31, 2027, at 23:59 (Quito time, UTC-5).
2. Complete form	All required fields have been completed and the final declaration has been accepted.
3. Thematic relevance	The work addresses methane, falls within a thematic area under Section 3.2, and concerns an energy-related sector or area of application under Section 3.3.
4. Regional scope	Identifies at least one country in Latin America and the Caribbean to which its data, experience, or potential applications relate. An international study is eligible if it explicitly analyzes its application to the region.
5. Access and content	The PDF or link allows the file to be opened and read without a password or access request, and the main body includes the eight elements in Section 5.1.
6. Format	The document meets the length, language, and format requirements in Section 5.2.

Only applications meeting all six requirements will proceed to technical evaluation. The coordinating team will document compliance with each requirement and, where applicable, the grounds for ineligibility, without changing the submission or adding evidence after the deadline.

5. Technical Evaluation of Submissions

Each eligible submission will receive the same number of initial evaluations, always from more than one evaluator, conducted independently and without access to other evaluators' scores. Only the five criteria, their maximum point values, and the rubric in Annex A will be used.

5.1. Composition and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Committee

OEMLAC will establish a committee of specialists in the thematic areas and sectors covered by the call, drawn from public institutions, companies, universities, research centers, and technical organizations, seeking a diversity of expertise and regional experience.

Committee members will score eligible submissions individually using the rubric and substantiate each rating with references to pages, tables, figures, or sources in the PDF. Following score calculations and the review of discrepancies (Sections 8.4 and 9.1), the committee will issue a technical recommendation identifying eligible submissions. It may not change the weights, thresholds, or tie-breaking rules.

The OEMLAC coordinating team will verify eligibility, assign submissions according to evaluators' subject-matter expertise, and ensure that no conflicts of interest exist. It will also consolidate ratings using the published formula, arrange additional evaluations, and apply the selection ranking and tie-breaking rules (Section 9.3). The allocation of slots and announcement of results will not alter scores.

Committee members must protect the information contained in applications and evaluations and comply with Section 12 on impartiality and conflicts of interest. Before evaluating, all committee members will receive the same rubric and instructions.

5.2. Evaluation Criteria and Maximum Points

No.	Evaluation criterion	Aspect assessed	Evaluation source	Maximum points
1	**Technical Quality**	Clearly defined problem and objective, with a described method appropriate to the type of work.	Objective and methodology in the form and PDF	25
2	**Support for Results**	Traceability and verification of results through relevant quantitative or qualitative evidence.	Results and evidence in the form and PDF	25
3	**Contribution to Latin America and the Caribbean**	Demonstrable usefulness for specific users and decisions in the region.	Regional contribution in the form and PDF	25
4	**Application and Replication**	Conditions, resources, barriers, and procedures for applying or replicating the contribution.	Application or replication in the form and PDF	15
5	**Clarity and Coherence**	Clear structure, internal consistency, and substantive alignment with the form.	Full PDF and its consistency with the form	10
Maximum total score				**100**

5.3. Rating Scale from 0 to 5

Each evaluator will assign an integer rating from 0 to 5 to each criterion: the highest level whose conditions are fully met. Levels 4 and 5 include the conditions of the preceding level; levels 0, 1, and 2 are distinguished by their descriptions.

Half-point ratings and points for aspects outside the rubric are not permitted. Each rating must be justified by specific evidence showing why the level is or is not met.

5.4. Calculation of the Total Score

For each criterion, the rating will be the arithmetic mean of the valid evaluations, with no intermediate rounding, and will be converted into points as follows:

Criterion points = (Average rating ÷ 5) × Maximum points for the criterion

The total score is the sum of the points for the five criteria (maximum 100), rounded only once to two decimal places (if the third decimal is 5 or higher, the second decimal is rounded up). This score determines the 70-point threshold and selection ranking; the average-rating threshold in Section 9.2 is checked without rounding.

5.5. Guidelines for Applying the Criteria

- All types of submissions may achieve any rating level. Evidence is assessed according to the result presented (measurement, calculation, simulation, document analysis, method, or evidence-based recommendation), without requiring implementation or quantification when these are not relevant.
- Innovation is not a requirement. Document length, annexes, the reputation of authors or institutions, and country of origin do not earn additional points.
- Each criterion assesses only the aspect defined in Section 8.2. Repeating a claim in the form, main body, and annexes does not earn additional points; the absence of tables or figures is not penalized if the work does not require them.
- For Criteria 1 through 4, verifiable information in the PDF takes precedence. Material contradictions between the form and PDF (those that change the objective, method, data, results, or conclusions) are considered only under Clarity and Coherence; differences in wording are not penalized.

6. Selection of Submissions

6.1. Review of Discrepancies among Evaluators

The coordinating team will verify the calculations and application of the rubric. If the difference between the highest and lowest total scores in the initial evaluations exceeds 20 points, one additional evaluation will be commissioned using the same rubric, conducted by a person outside the committee who has no conflict of interest or prior access to the scores.

The final rating for each criterion will be the arithmetic mean of all valid evaluations, including the additional one, and the total will be recalculated under Section 8.4. No rating will be discarded because it differs from the others; the resulting average resolves the discrepancy even if the range still exceeds 20 points. Calculation errors will be corrected and recorded; evaluations involving a conflict of interest will be replaced before the final calculation.

6.2. Minimum Eligibility Thresholds

After discrepancies have been resolved, a submission will be eligible for selection only if both conditions are met:

- A total score of at least **70 points** out of 100.

- An average rating of at least **3 out of 5** in both Technical Quality and Support for Results, assessed separately.

6.3. Selection Ranking and Allocation of Slots

Submissions eligible for selection will be ranked in descending order of their total scores. A tie exists only when the total scores calculated under Section 8.4 are identical.

Ties will be broken by comparing the higher unrounded average rating in this order: Technical Quality, Support for Results, Contribution to Latin America and the Caribbean, Application and Replication, and Clarity and Coherence.

If the tie persists, OEMLAC will decide based on the relevance of the submissions to the call and their contribution to the technical programs of the IV Regional Summit of Methane and COEMLAC, documenting the reasons for its decision.

OEMLAC will publish the number of slots available for each participation option before the submission deadline. Offers will follow the selection ranking; eligible submissions for which no slot is available will be placed on a waiting list in the same order and will receive any slots that become available or are added for the corresponding option. Meeting the thresholds does not guarantee selection.

7. Announcement of Results and Participation Options

OEMLAC will inform the designated contact person whether the submission was selected or placed on the waiting list. Selected applicants will be informed of the participation options offered and given the same deadline to respond; if they do not accept within that period, the slot will be offered to the next eligible submission (Section 9.3).

The participation option offered does not affect the technical score. Inclusion in the White Paper will be communicated separately, together with its editorial requirements, and will require author approval before publication.

Selection does not include travel, accommodation, or other expenses. Any support will be expressly communicated in writing and will not affect scores or selection ranking.

8. Authorship and Use of Information

8.1. Authorship and Authorization for Use

The designated contact person declares that all authors have consented and that the work is authorized for submission. The information will be used to evaluate and compile the results of the call; the dissemination of selected submissions will be limited to authorized content and will respect their authorship.

8.2. Disclosure of Artificial Intelligence Use

If artificial intelligence tools were used, the document must identify which tools were used, for which tasks, and how the generated content was verified. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of the information, the originality of the work, and source verification.

8.3. Confidentiality of Information

The PDF and its annexes must be an authorized version suitable for sharing, containing no confidential information. Internal data must be anonymized or aggregated, with their source, period, and analysis procedure indicated. Confidential data are not required, but an unverifiable claim cannot support rubric levels that require evidence. Institutional dissemination is governed by Section 11.1.

9. Impartiality and Conflicts of Interest

Before receiving a submission, each evaluator must disclose any relationship that could compromise independence: authorship or direct collaboration, membership in the applicant team, direct supervision, or a financial interest in its selection.

In such cases, the evaluator must recuse themselves, the coordinating team will reassign the submission, and the evaluator will not participate in score reviews or decisions concerning that work. This rule also applies to additional evaluations.

Annex A. Technical Evaluation Rubric

Each criterion has six levels, from 0 to 5. The rating is the highest level whose conditions are fully met; levels 4 and 5 include the preceding level. Level 3, shown in bold, represents the expected standard but does not, by itself, guarantee eligibility for selection (see thresholds in Section 9.2). Evidence may be quantitative or qualitative, provided it allows the conditions to be verified.

Technical Quality

Maximum score: 25 points. Evaluation sources: objective and methodology in the form and PDF.

Rating from 0 to 5	Conditions for assigning the rating
0	Neither an objective nor a work method can be identified.
1	Identifies only the objective or only the method; or mentions both without describing the procedure.
2	Identifies the objective and procedure, but essential steps are missing or the procedure cannot address the stated objective.
3	**Clearly defines the problem and objective; describes the main steps and the sources or data used in a procedure that is appropriate for achieving that objective.**
4	Meets Level 3 and specifies the applicable scope, limitations, and assumptions; if no assumptions are needed, explains why.
5	Meets Level 4 and provides the input data, tools, parameters, or analytical rules needed for another person to reproduce the procedure, as appropriate to the type of work.

Support for Results

Maximum score: 25 points. Evaluation sources: results, data, sources, references, and supporting evidence in the form and PDF.

Rating from 0 to 5	Conditions for assigning the rating
0	Does not present an identifiable main result, finding, or recommendation.
1	Presents a main result but does not identify supporting data, sources, or evidence.
2	Identifies evidence but does not link it to the main result or provide enough information to verify it.
3	**The main result is supported by identifiable, locatable data or sources, with a page, link, or record included in the PDF, and explains how that evidence supports the result.**
4	Meets Level 3 and describes the evidence sufficiently for interpretation: for quantitative results, figures, units, period, and a comparison reference where applicable; for qualitative results, documents or cases analyzed, analytical criteria, and associated findings.
5	Meets Level 4 and allows independent reconstruction of the calculation or analysis underpinning the result, using accessible data or sources or information in the PDF and its annexes; also identifies applicable uncertainties, limitations, or biases.

Contribution to Latin America and the Caribbean

Maximum score: 25 points. Evaluation sources: regional contribution, users, decisions, and problem addressed in the form and PDF.

Rating from 0 to 5	Conditions for assigning the rating
0	Does not identify a contribution to Latin America and the Caribbean.
1	Merely states that the topic is important, without describing a specific contribution.
2	Describes a general contribution but does not identify its specific users or the decision or problem it helps address.
3	**Identifies specific users and a decision or problem to which the work contributes in at least one country in Latin America and the Caribbean.**
4	Meets Level 3 and compares its contribution with existing information or solutions, citing sources that allow the gap or improvement addressed to be verified.
5	Meets Level 4 and demonstrates the contribution through a verifiable comparison with a baseline situation, an existing solution, or a reference scenario, specifying its scope and limitations. The demonstration may rely on actual application, testing, simulation, or evidence-based document analysis; implementation is not required.

Application and Replication

Maximum score: 15 points. Evaluation sources: potential for application or replication, conditions, barriers, and next steps in the form and PDF.

Rating from 0 to 5	Conditions for assigning the rating
0	Does not identify any potential use of the contribution.
1	States that the contribution is applicable or replicable without describing a specific use.
2	Describes a specific use but does not identify the conditions required to implement it.
3	**Describes how the contribution can be applied and identifies the main relevant requirements concerning resources, data, capabilities, or regulations.**
4	Meets Level 3 and identifies the main barriers and concrete measures to address them.
5	Meets Level 4 and presents evidence of application or adaptation in another context, or an application or replication plan specifying stakeholders, resources, stages, and a procedure for verifying results. Either approach may receive the same rating.

Clarity and Coherence

Maximum score: 10 points. Evaluation sources: structure and consistency of the full PDF, and substantive alignment between the form and PDF.

Rating from 0 to 5	Conditions for assigning the rating
0	At least two of the three central elements of the work—objective, method, and results—cannot be identified.
1	Only two of the three central elements can be identified; or all three are present, but their fragmented presentation prevents the reader from following the work's sequence.
2	The sequence can be followed, but internal contradictions alter the meaning of the method, data, results, or conclusions.
3	**The objective, method, and results are easy to identify and follow a logical sequence without material internal contradictions.**
4	Meets Level 3 and uses terms and units consistently, with clear writing and identified sources. Tables or figures, where needed, include titles, sources, and applicable units.
5	Meets Level 4, and the form and PDF are consistent in the objective, method, data, results, and conclusions presented in both, without material contradictions. Differences in wording that do not change the meaning do not lower the rating.